

JAN 09 2007

Appln. Serial No. 10/814,425  
Attorney's Docket No. 42P18586  
Reply to Non-Final Office Action mailed on September 28, 2006

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-5, 7-9 and 11-24 remain pending in the application, with claims 1, 8, 14 and 21 being the independent claims. Independent claims 1, 8, 14 and 21 and dependent claims 2, 3, 5, 7, 11-13, 15-19 and 22 are sought to be amended. Claims 6 and 10 are sought to be cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Entry and consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested. No new matter is believed to have been introduced by this Amendment.

Applicant has made the above Amendment to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Based on the above Amendment and the following Remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all outstanding rejections.

***Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph***

Claims 1-7, 10-13 and 15-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 6 and 10 have been cancelled rendering the rejection to these claims moot. Applicant carefully reviewed the Examiner's comments regarding the issues with the antecedent basis of the remaining claims and amended the claims accordingly. Applicant believes that all of the issues with the antecedent basis of the remaining claims were addressed and respectfully requests that the rejections to these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, be reconsidered and withdrawn.

**Appln. Serial No. 10/814,425**  
**Attorney's Docket No. 42P18586**  
**Reply to Non-Final Office Action mailed on September 28, 2006**

***Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101***

Claims 21-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter. Independent claim 21 has been amended to recite "computer-readable medium". Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections to these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 101 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

***Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(e) and 103(a)***

Claims 8, 9, 12, 13, 21 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent Appl. No. 2003/0233592 A1 (hereinafter referred to as "Lin"). Claims 1-5, 10, 11 and 14-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,313,838 B1 (hereinafter referred to as "Deering") in view of Lin. Claim 10 has been cancelled rendering the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) moot with respect to this claim. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections with respect to pending claims 1-5, 8, 9 and 11-24 for at least the following reason.

Independent claims 1, 8, 14 and 21 have been amended to include a similar feature of signaling an interrupt, as follows: signaling of an interrupt to the first processor by the second processor upon completion of the second task (claim 1); wherein the processor to signal an interrupt to a central processing unit (CPU) upon completion of the rendering the one or more graphics surfaces (claim 8); wherein the graphics controller to signal an interrupt to the CPU upon completion of at least one of rendering of the image and displaying of the image on the monitor (claim 14); and wherein the target processor to signal an interrupt to the processor upon completion of at least one of the plurality of tasks (claim 21). Support for the

**Appln. Serial No. 10/814,425**  
**Attorney's Docket No. 42P18586**  
**Reply to Non-Final Office Action mailed on September 28, 2006**

Amendment can be found in original claim 6 and in the specification at least on page 10, paragraph 0027. Lin and Deering, either taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest this similar feature of signaling an interrupt, as claimed. For at least this reason, independent claims 1, 8, 14 and 21 and their respective dependent claims 2-5, 9, 11-13 and 15-24 are distinguishable from Lin and Deering, either taken alone or in combination. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections to these claims under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(e) and 103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

**INVITATION FOR A TELEPHONE INTERVIEW**

The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned, Molly A. McCall, at (703) 633-0931 if there remains any issue with allowance of the case.

JAN 09 2007

Appln. Serial No. 10/814,425  
Attorney's Docket No. 42P18586  
Reply to Non-Final Office Action mailed on September 28, 2006

**CONCLUSION**

Applicant respectfully submits that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed accommodated or rendered moot. Thus, Applicant believes that the present application is in condition for allowance, and as such, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections, and allowance of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 9, 2007

/Molly A. McCall/Reg. No. 46,126  
Molly A. McCall  
(703) 633-0931

P18586 reply to non-final OA